

VZCZCXYZ0002  
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHNO #0343/01 2681132  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
R 241132Z SEP 08  
FM USMISSION USNATO  
TO RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC  
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 2275  
INFO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC  
RHMFISS/CDRUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE  
RHMFISS/CDR USJFCOM NORFOLK VA  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE  
RHMFISS/USNMR SHAPE BE  
ZEN/USDELMC BRUSSELS BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 000343

SIPDIS

STATE FOR T, EUR/PRA, EUR/RPM, AND AC/SEA  
DEFENSE FOR GSA (BENKERT, GROSS)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 09/25/2018  
TAGS: [MARR](#) [MCAAP](#) [MNUC](#) [NATO](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#)  
SUBJECT: NATO SENIOR DEFENSE GROUP ON PROLIFERATION (DGP)  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING, SEPTEMBER 5, 2008

Classified By: DEFAD BRUCE WEINROD FOR REASONS 1.4 (B) and (D)

11. (C) The NATO Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP) Steering Committee met at NATO HQ on September 5. The meeting was chaired by Ms. Laura Gross of the US (OSD) and Mr. Knut Jahr of the Norwegian MOD. The Chair greeted Albania and Croatia as new members of the DGP with NATO Invitee status and welcomed new national representatives that had assumed their posts during the summer break.

12. (C) The second draft of NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy to Prevent the Proliferation of WMD and Enhance the Alliance's CBRN Defence was issued on September 3 and formed the basis for considerable discussion on the substance of the Policy and on milestones for future work. The new draft reflects the work of the syndicates at the 2008 DGP Seminar and other significant considerations and is based on three pillars: Prevent, Counter/Protect, and Respond/Recover. As a consequence of the current situation with Russia, the document contains some bracketed text that will be resolved in due course. The Chair reviewed the milestones and proposed that a third draft be ready for the NAC WMD Seminar on October 2. Germany, supported by others, replied that this schedule was overly ambitious and that the second draft was mature enough for the purposes of the WMD Seminar. France then introduced wide-ranging comments on the document: they were skeptical about its synergy and coherence with other efforts, amongst the Alliance as a whole and individual nations as well as the G8 and the European Union; they had doubts about the delivery of intelligence; and they saw many situations requiring case-by-case treatment. Italy made a plea for streamlining the document by removing material already found in other policy documents. The UK cautioned that the effort was ambitious but must be grounded in reality, must account for scarce resources, and must have shared ownership with other NATO bodies earlier rather than later in its development. The Chair acknowledged all of the points made and invited the nations to submit their comments in writing by September 29 so that they can be shared with all prior to the WMD Seminar.

13. (C) The Committee reviewed its cooperative efforts with the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC). The DGP and the SCEPC held a joint meeting in 2005 and, since that time, the SCEPC has made significant changes to its work plan. The Chair acknowledged that there continues to be cooperative effort at the working level and offered that there might now be sufficient common ground for conducting a

second joint meeting with the SCEPC. France outlined its position on joint activities with the SCEPC: each agenda item for such a joint meeting must be individually approved in the separate committees in advance. The Chair announced that a food-for-thought paper on the subject would be forthcoming. The Chair further stated that the next meeting of the DGP with representatives from other NATO bodies would take place on October 29 and indicated that an invitation to the other bodies would be issued by 19 September.

¶4. (C) Poland provided a brief review of the 2008 DGP Seminar held in Torun in June. The report of the Seminar was distributed on September 4 with a request for comments by September 19. As in past years, the report has an annex with an executive summary containing basic comments and recommendations and another annex with full details. Only the executive summary is intended for endorsement by the NAC. The more detailed annex is for the use of the DGP only. Nations had just received the document and consequently they were not prepared to discuss its contents at this meeting.

¶5. (C) The WMD Centre updated the Committee on planning for the sixth annual NAC WMD Seminar. In July, the DGP approved the Seminar objective, which is to highlight key issues related to the comprehensive CBRN policy discussed in paragraph 2. The scenario will focus on a maritime radiological incident and themes and questions have been identified to promote discussion amongst ambassadors. Germany has offered to provide the video production support needed to structure the presentations. There will be a meeting of points-of-contact on September 17 at which the WMD Centre will provide detailed briefing material to facilitate

national preparations. A hot wash will be conducted after the Seminar on October 6 to capture key points for follow-up.

¶6. (C) The International Military Staff (IMS) updated the DGP on the status of the Disease Surveillance System (DSS). A site survey was completed in Kosovo in August in preparation for a DSS experiment which will follow in November. The objective is to test the interoperability and security of national surveillance systems under real-world conditions. Negotiations continue in Munich to implement the Multinational Medical Analysis Centre. More nations are expected to join the arrangement in due course. In reference to the August 25 paper on expediting the DSS, the US, the UK and France have reworked the document based on the deficiencies identified by ISAF. France felt that it was important that the Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services (COMEDS) review the document next. The COMEDS representative stated that they already reviewed the document and found it to be a complementary approach. The US said that we need to reach a compromise because the intent is to task the COMEDS in the paper. The Chair invited national comments by September 19.

¶7. (C) Allied Command Operations (ACO) reported the status of the Combined-Joint CBRN Task Force (TF) for rotations of the NRF out to 2014. Rotation 13 is a critical problem as the UK has withdrawn its offer to lead, although they will retain the lead for rotation 14. This problem and others will be tackled at a Force Generation Conference to be held at SHAPE on September 24. By way of finding unconventional force generation alternatives, the NMA proposed that the CBRN Center of Excellence (CoE) could be asked to provide a modified Joint Assessment Team for the TF. The CoE steering committee will meet September 16-17 and could be approached on the idea as it is the MOU member nations that must decide whether or not to make such an offer. There is no requirement for formal action on the part of the DGP regarding this issue. In a separate briefing, the IMS explained their preliminary thoughts on the prospects for multinational or common funding for the TF, a tasking from the 2007 NAC WMD Seminar. The envisioned scope of this effort is to overcome capability shortfalls and to provide for training and exercises. The IMS concluded that more research into this task was required as there are many military and political factors involved. The Czech Republic

provided some rationale on the topic: nations must develop their own capabilities or they must have access to common sources of funding; common sources are preferable because national development programs are unpredictable. The UK, joined by France and Germany, expressed their unease with expectations about the prospect for common-funding of future capabilities. Italy admitted confusion concerning the exact intent of the 2007 tasking. Germany will report on its experience with NRF 10 at the DGP Plenary meeting on October 12.

18. (C) Under the rubric of International Outreach, the Chair informed the Committee that substantial progress had been made with Ukraine over the Summer. After the May DGP Plenary meeting, a letter on CBRN defence cooperation opportunities was sent to the Ukrainian authorities and a positive reply was received. A DGP-Ukraine workshop on training opportunities will take place on the margins of the February DGP Steering Committee meeting and the WMD Centre and IMS were requested to make the necessary arrangements. Initial plans for the DGP-Ukraine meeting in Kyiv in May will be presented by the Czech Republic at the October DGP Plenary meeting. A notice will be sent out inviting other interested nations to join an October meeting on DGP support for the development of Ukraine's CBRN defense policy. A brief to the NATO-Ukraine Commission on the DGP's efforts is being coordinated.

19. (C) The International Partners Table-top Exercise conducted in Spring 2008 was a success and the Committee discussed the possibilities of follow-on activities in April 2009. Because of security restrictions at NATO HQ, it was felt that a near-by facility would be an easier venue. Belgium has offered such a venue at its NBC defence school in Namur. Formal planning documents will be forthcoming.

10. (C) Under Any Other Business, the Czech Republic reported that it had distributed its food-for-thought paper on the transformation of CBRN defence units and capabilities, as foreseen at the DGP Seminar in Poland. The intent of the paper is to stimulate discussion on the topic and they invited comments by September 19.

11. (U) The Chair reminded the Committee that the next meetings of the DGP were the NAC WMD Seminar on October 2, the Plenary on October 2, and the Steering Committee on October 29.  
VOLKER